JANET L. CHUBB, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 176
LOUIS M. BUBALA III, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 8974
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
50 West Liberty
Suite 950
Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone (775) 322-7400
Facsimile (775) 322-9049
Email: lbubala@armstrongteasdale.com
bsalinas@armstrongteasdale.com
AND

Eric Goldstein, Esq.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
Shipman & Goodwin, LLP
One Constitution Plaza
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 251-5000
Facsimile (860) 251-5218
Email: egoldstein@goodwin.com

Attorneys for Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC and
Domino's Pizza Master Issuer LLC

ELECTRONICALLY FILED ON OCTOBER 30, 2011

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

In re MATTHEW LOUIS MATLOCK, Debtor. DOMINO'S PIZZA FRANCHISING LLC AND DOMINO'S PIZZA MASTER ISSUER LLC, Movants, vs. MATTHEW LOUIS MATLOCK, Respondent.	Chapter 13 Case No. BK-N-11-52557-btb **REPLY TO DEBTOR'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM STAY** Hearing Date: 11/8/11 Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.

Domino's Pizza Master Issuer LLC ("DPMI") and Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC ("DPF" and together with DPMI, "Domino's"), hereby reply to Matthew L. Matlock's (the "Debtor's") opposition (Doc. Id. No. 37) ("Opposition") to Domino's Motion for Relief from Automatic Stay to Enforce Injunction Requiring Debtor to Transfer Telephone Number (Doc. Id.

No. 26) ("Motion for Relief from Stay").

In his Opposition, the Debtor argues, alternatively, that relief from stay should not be granted to enforce the Order for Final Judgment[1] because (i) Domino's slept on its rights causing the Debtor to spend significant sums advertising the telephone number; (ii) the Debtor, as a bona fide purchaser, acquired the telephone number from Calvin Yeager free and clear of Domino's claim to it; and (iii) Domino's is improperly trying to enforce the Michigan District Court's Order for Final Judgment without filing a complaint against the Debtor and serving process on him. Each one of these grounds is either factually incorrect or legally without merit.

In support of its reply, Domino's relies on the Supplemental Declaration of Joseph Devereaux (the "Supplemental Devereaux Declaration") and the Declaration of Eric Goldstein ("Goldstein Declaration"), and further states as follows:

I. The Debtor Had Personal Knowledge of Domino's Right to the Telephone Number Since At Least February 18, 2010

1. The Debtor argues that Domino's slept on its rights and waited two years to try to obtain possession of the telephone number, and in so doing has allowed the Debtor "to spend many thousands of dollars on advertising for his business using that phone number." (Opposition, pp. 2-3.) This statement evinces, at best, that the Debtor has a selective memory because he has known since at least February 18, 2010, that the Michigan District Court ordered that the telephone number be transferred to Domino's.

2. On January 25, 2010, the Michigan District Court entered the Preliminary Injunction Order, in which the court enjoined Calvin Yeager and Valley Pizza, Inc., *as well as their agents, servants and employees, and those persons and entities in active concert or participation or privity with any of them* from violating the post-termination obligations of the Franchise Agreement and required them "to transfer the telephone numbers to Domino's . . . ." (Devereaux Declaration, Ex. 2, pp. 8-9 (emphasis added).)[2]

---

[1] Capitalized terms not defined herein shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Motion for Relief from Stay.

[2] The Michigan District Court ordered multiple telephone numbers to be surrendered. Citations to the Devereaux Declaration refer to the Declaration of Joseph Devereaux in Support of the Motion for Relief from Stay dated September 19, 2011, which is available at Doc. Id. No. 25.

3. On February 18, 2010, the Debtor was personally served by Deputy Sheriff Arne G. Digerud with a copy of the Preliminary Injunction Order. (See Devereaux Declaration, Ex. 3.)[3]

4. On May 4, 2010, the Michigan District Court entered the Order for Final Judgment in which it ordered, *inter alia*, that its preliminary injunction dated January 25, 2010, "is now a permanent injunction" and further clarified that the telephone number "775-265-2929 shall be transferred to Domino's." (Devereaux Declaration, Ex. 4, at p. 2.) The Debtor was also served with a copy of the Order for Final Judgment. (See Devereaux Declaration, Ex. 5.)

5. On August 3, 2010, Domino's registered the Order for Final Judgment with the Nevada District Court and commenced a proceeding to enforce that judgment against the Debtor (the "Nevada District Court Proceeding"). (See Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC v. Yeager, Civ. Action No. 3:10-CV-560 (D. Nev.), Doc. Id. No. 1.) Because the Debtor continued to use the telephone number in violation of the Order for Final Judgment, on September 24, 2010, Domino's moved to enforce the Order of Final Judgment in the Nevada District Court. (Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC v. Yeager, Civ. Action No. 3:10-CV-560 (D. Nev.), Doc. Id. No. 7.) Domino's efforts to enforce the Order for Final Judgment against the Debtor in the Nevada District Court Proceeding continued right up to the Petition Date. (See Motion for Relief from Stay ¶¶ 13-17; see generally Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC v. Yeager, Civ. Action No. 3:10-CV-560 (D. Nev.).)

6. Domino's has not slept on its rights. It has vigorously sought to enforce the post-termination provisions of the Franchise Agreement and obtain possession and control over the telephone number used at the former Domino's Pizza franchises since December 2009.

7. Moreover, the Debtor has known of Domino's right to the telephone number since at least February 18, 2010, when he was personally served with the Preliminary Injunction Order,

[3] It bears noting that the Debtor's counsel, Attorney Robert P. Huckaby, was involved in defending Calvin Yeager in Domino's action in the Michigan District Court. While he did not file an appearance in that case, he did sign Mr. Yeager's answer to Domino's complaint. (See Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC v. Yeager, Civ. Action No. 2:09-cv-14704 (E.D. Mich.), Docket Id. No. 12, at p. 2.)

which provided that all persons and entities in active concert or participation or privity with any of Yeager or Valley Pizza, Inc. were enjoined from violating the post-termination obligations of the Franchise Agreement and were ordered to, *inter alia*, "transfer the telephone numbers to Domino's . . . ." (Devereaux Declaration, Ex. 2, at pp. 8-9.)

8. In February 2010, more than *twenty months* ago, the Debtor had a choice. He could either comply with the Michigan District Court's Preliminary Injunction Order or ignore the order and continue to use the telephone number. He chose the latter course of conduct and did so to his peril.

9. Domino's did not cause the Debtor to purportedly "spend many thousands of dollars" advertising a telephone number that did not belong to him. (See Opposition, p. 2.) He chose to do so notwithstanding personal knowledge of the Michigan District Court's order that the telephone number be transferred to Domino's. The Debtor has no one but himself and Calvin Yeager to blame for spending money advertising a telephone number that does not belong to him.

II. The Debtor "Acquired" the Telephone Number Subject to Domino's Claims

10. The Debtor also claims he is the rightful owner of the telephone number because he bought it from Yeager and had no notice that the telephone number was supposed to have been transferred to Domino's. (Opposition, p. 3.)

11. First, as noted above, the Debtor certainly had notice of Domino's right to the telephone number on February 18, 2010.

12. Second, the Debtor knew when he "acquired" the telephone number that it was previously used for the former Domino's Pizza store since he was formerly a manager of one of the Domino's Pizza stores operated by Yeager. (See Transcript of 341 Meeting of Creditors dated Sept. 23, 2011, at 15:12-18 (testifying that he was former manager of one of Yeager's Domino's Pizza stores), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1 to Goldstein Declaration). Further, the bill of sale purportedly transferring the telephone number indicated that it was not to be associated with Domino's Pizza. (See Declaration of Debtor in Opposition to Motion for Relief from Stay (hereinafter, "Debtor's Declaration"), Ex. C (Bill of Sale notes that telephone number cannot have any association with Domino's).)

13. Notwithstanding such knowledge, the Debtor appears to have not reviewed the Franchise Agreement before "acquiring" the telephone number. If he had done so, he would have clearly seen that Section 18.3(c) provides that Domino's has "the sole rights to and interest in all telephone numbers" and upon termination, Valley and Yeager had to transfer the telephone number to Domino's.

14. Third, the Debtor's argument, without citation to any legal authority, that he takes the telephone number not subject to Domino's claim to rightful ownership is completely without merit. The law does not allow a buyer of an asset – no matter how innocently – to acquire title to it from someone who did not have the authority to convey it.

15. It is beyond dispute that Yeager lacked the authority to sell the telephone number to Matlock after the Franchise Agreements were terminated on November 13, 2009. (See Devereaux Declaration, Ex. 1 § 18.3(c), at p. 26.) Indeed, U.S. Bankruptcy Court Chief Judge Christopher Klein recently granted Domino's relief from the automatic stay in the bankruptcy case filed by Yeager to enforce the Order for Final Judgment to obtain the telephone number that Yeager still possesses and uses in connection with his "Pronto Pizza" store in South Lake Tahoe, California. In granting relief from stay, Chief Judge Klein held that Yeager's interest in the telephone numbers had been terminated. (See U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of California, Case No. 11-39357, Civil Minutes on Motion for Relief from Automatic Stay, Doc. Id. No. 45, at p. 4 ("court concludes that cause exists for lifting the automatic stay where [Domino's] terminated Debtor['s] interest in the telephone numbers before the bankruptcy petition was filed and where, at the time the petition was filed, the Debtor had only, at most, a bare possessory interest in the subject properties . . ."), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 2 to the Goldstein Declaration.)

16. As noted in the Motion for Relief from Stay, a party wrongfully in possession of property of another cannot convey good title to such property to a third party. (See Motion for Relief from Stay ¶ 29 and cases cited therein.)

17. Moreover, the Debtor's continued possession and use of the telephone number, notwithstanding his claim to be a bona fide purchaser, is itself an act of conversion. "Any person

who purchases personal property of another from one other than the owner or someone authorized to sell is liable for conversion of property in a suit by the true owner, *regardless of whether the purchaser was honestly mistaken, or acted innocently, in good faith, and without knowledge of the seller's lack of right to make the sale.*" 18 Am. Jur. 2d Conversion § 29, at pp. 176-177 (2004) (emphasis added); see Kenyon v. Abel, 36 P.3d 1161, 1165 (Wyo. 2001) (holding that good faith purchaser is liable for conversion because original converter has no title to the property and "therefore, nothing can be conveyed to a bona fide purchaser for value"); Underhill Coal Mining Co. v. Hixon, 652 A.2d 343, 345 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1994) ("a good faith purchaser of the goods from the converter is also a converter"); see also Olin Corp. v. Cargo Carriers, Inc., 673 S.W.2d 211, 216 (Tex. App. 1984) ("One who purchases stolen property from a thief, no matter how innocently, acquires no title in the property; title remains in the owner"); Suburban Motors v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 218 Cal. App. 3d 1354, 1361 (Cal. App. 3d Dist. 1990) (same in context of sale of goods under Article 2 of the UCC).

18. Even assuming that the Debtor did not have personal knowledge of the terms of Section 18.3 of the Franchise Agreement at the time he claims to have "acquired" the telephone number, the law does not excuse such ignorance. If the buyer fails to confirm that the seller has the right, title and interest to the asset it seeks to convey, the buyer assumes the risk that the title conveyed is void. See Alamo Rent-A-Car, Inc. v. Mendenhall, 937 P.2d 69, ___, 113 Nev. 445, 451-452 (1997) (holding that sale of goods by thief does not vest title in the purchaser as against the rightful owner).

III. The Debtor's Wrongful Possession of the Telephone Number on the Petition Date Is Subject to a Constructive Trust in Favor of Domino's

19. At best, the Debtor's wrongful possession of the telephone number on the Petition Date was subject to a constructive trust in favor of Domino's. A constructive trust may be

imposed to redress unjust enrichment.[4] See Waldman v. Maini, 195 P.3d 850, 857 & n.22, 124 Nev. 1121, 1131 & n. 22 (2008) (constructive trust is not "'limited to [fraud and] misconduct cases; it redresses unjust enrichment, not wrongdoing'"); Bemis v. Estate of Bemis, 967 P.2d 437, 441, 114 Nev. 1021, 1027 (1998) (same). "A constructive trust is a remedial device by which the holder of legal title to property is held to be a trustee of that property for the benefit of another who in good conscience is entitled to it." Locken v. Locken, 650 P.2d 803, ___, 98 Nev. 369, 372 (1982); see LeasePartners Corp. v. Robert L. Brooks Trust Dated Nov. 12, 1975, 942 P.2d 182, 187, 113 Nev. 747, 755 (1997) ("unjust enrichment occurs 'when ever [sic] a person has and retains a benefit which in equity and good conscience belongs to another'"). Property subject to a constructive trust is not property of a debtor's bankruptcy estate. See Mitsui Mfrs. Bank v. Unicom Computer Corp. (In re Unicom Computer Corp.), 13 F.3d 321, 324 (9th Cir. 1994); *see also* 11 U.S.C. §§ 541(b)(1), 541(d).

20. The Debtor is being unjustly enriched by his continuing wrongful possession of the telephone number, which in good conscience belongs to Domino's. The Franchise Agreement clearly provides that the telephone number belongs to Domino's. In Section 18.3(c), Yeager and Valley agreed that Domino's has "the sole rights to and interest in all telephone numbers" and upon termination, Yeager and Valley were to have signed a written authorization directing the telephone company to transfer the telephone number to Domino's. (Devereaux Declaration, Ex. 1 § 18.3(c), at p. 26.)

21. In light of Section 18.3(c) of the Franchise Agreement, the Michigan District Court permanently enjoined Calvin Yeager, Lakeside Pizza, Inc., and Valley Pizza, Inc., *as well as their agents, servants and employees, and those persons and entities in active concert or*

---

[4] Traditionally, courts in Nevada have required the showing of the following three elements to establish a constructive trust: "(1) [that] a confidential relationship exists between the parties; (2) retention of legal title by the holder thereof against another would be inequitable; and (3) the existence of such a trust is essential to the effectuation of justice." Waldman v. Maini, 195 P.3d 850, 857 (Nev. 2008). However, the first factor, the existence of a confidential relationship, was required to show an inference of fraud or undue influence. Id. It now appears that a showing of such fraud (and, thus, the existence of a confidential relationship) is no longer required to establish a constructive trust; instead, a constructive trust may arise from unjust enrichment. Id., 858.

participation or privity with any of them from violating the post-termination obligations and ordered them "to transfer the telephone numbers to Domino's . . . ." (Devereaux Declaration, Ex. 2, pp. 8-9. (emphasis added), and Ex. 3, p. 2.) In particular, the Michigan District Court ordered that the telephone number "775-265-2929 shall be transferred to Domino's." (Id., Ex. 3, p. 2.)

22. The Debtor is subject to this permanent injunction. At a minimum, the Debtor was a manager of the former Domino's Pizza stores operated by Yeager. (See Goldstein Declaration Ex. 1, at 15:12-18.) Indeed, he may have been a partner with Yeager in the operation of those Domino's Pizza stores. In an article in The Record Courier dated January 19, 2010, concerning the Debtor's opening of the "Pronto Pizza" store, it was reported that it was "a little more than two years ago when [the Debtor] purchased the Valley's only Domino's franchise with a partner." (See Scott Neuffer, Owner discusses change from Domino's to Pronto Pizza, The Record Courier, Jan. 20, 2010, available at http://www.recordcourier.com/article/20100120/NEWS/100119737, a copy which is attached as Exhibit 3 to the Goldstein Declaration.) In describing his new "Pronto Pizza" store, the Debtor described it as "the same owner and same crew" as the former Domino's Pizza store. (See id.) In addition to managing and/or being a partner in the former Domino's Pizza stores, the Debtor was also in privity with Yeager by virtue of, *inter alia*, the bill of sale for the telephone number. (See Debtor's Declaration ¶ 4 & Ex. C.) As a former manager and/or partner with Yeager in the Domino's Pizza stores, and the buyer of the telephone number from Yeager, the Debtor was an agent, servant, employee of Yeager (or his wholly owned entities) or a person in active concert or participation or privity with Yeager, and, thus, subject to the Michigan District Court's permanent injunction.

23. Domino's is not pursuing this telephone number to be, in the Debtor's words, "a bully." (Debtor's Declaration ¶ 18.) Rather, the reason for the inclusion of Section 18.3(c) in the Franchise Agreement and Domino's pursuit of its right to the telephone number under that provision is quite simple. The telephone numbers for franchised Domino's Pizza stores are listed and known to the general public under the "Domino's Pizza" brand and trademark. (Supplemental Devereaux Declaration, ¶ 7.) Thus, for the more than two years that the Gardnerville, Nevada store was operated as a Domino's Pizza, customers of the store associated

its telephone number with Domino's Pizza. Section 18.3(c) of the Franchise Agreements provides the mechanism by which Domino's obtains control over the telephone number to protect its brand and goodwill in that area.

24. The Debtor's continuing use of the telephone number for the former Domino's Pizza store located in Gardnerville, Nevada is precluding Domino's from preserving and protecting its goodwill that has accumulated in the area and which is associated with the store's telephone number. (Supplemental Devereaux Declaration ¶ 8; see Devereaux Declaration ¶ 27 (inability to obtain telephone numbers is negatively impacting ability to refranchise the area).)

25. As the Michigan District Court has ordered, the telephone number belongs to Domino's, the Debtor is wrongfully in possession of it, and good conscience requires that it be returned to Domino's. Thus, on the Petition Date, the Debtor, at best, remains in wrongful possession of the telephone number in constructive trust for Domino's, and such property is not property of his bankruptcy estate.

IV. Domino's May Enforce the Order for Final Judgment in the Nevada District Court Proceeding

26. The Debtor's argument that the Nevada District Court lacks personal jurisdiction over him and that that he is entitled to due process by service of a summons and complaint to enforce the Order for Final Judgment is misguided. (See Opposition, at pp. 2-3). At the outset, Domino's does not seek to enforce its rights in this Court; rather, it seeks relief from the automatic stay to continue the Nevada District Court Proceeding against the Debtor. If the stay is lifted, the Debtor can raise these arguments in the Nevada District Court Proceeding. Indeed, such claims had been made before the Debtor filed for bankruptcy.

27. Moreover, the Debtor's argument fails substantively. First, the Nevada District Court has personal jurisdiction over the Debtor because he resides in Nevada. (Doc. Id. No. 1, at pp. 1-2 (stating, under penalty of perjury, that Debtor is resident of Nevada).)

28. Second, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure permit Domino's to enforce the Order for Final Judgment without filing a new complaint against the Debtor as a defendant. Rule 65(d)(2) specifically permits enforcement of an injunction against "the parties' officers, agents,

servants, employees, and attorneys, and other persons who are in active concern or participation" with the parties or their affiliates. Rule 70(a) similarly provides that "if a judgment requires a party to . . . perform any other specific act and the party fails to comply, . . . the court may order the act to be done . . . by another person appointed by the court." Rule 70 is sometimes read in concert with Rule 71, which states that "when an order . . . may be enforced against a nonparty, the procedure for enforcing the order is the same as for a party."

29. U.S. District Judge Royce Lamberth summarized the application of these rules as follows:

> In certain circumstances, a judgment may be enforced against nonparties. See 12 Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 3033, at 177. For example, as stated in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d), an injunction is binding upon the parties and "upon those persons in active concert or participation with them that receive actual notice of the order . . ." A number of cases have affirmed the courts' authority to enforce their orders on nonparties, based in part upon Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 71. According to the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, "It seems clear that Rule 71 was intended to assure that process be made available to enforce court orders in favor of and against persons who are properly affected by them, even if they are not parties to the action." Lasky v. Quinlan, 558 F.2d 1133, 1137 (2d Cir.1977) (citing 7 J. Moore, Federal Practice at 71.10 (1975)). This view was adopted by the Ninth Circuit in Westlake North Property Owners Association v. City of Thousand Oaks, 915 F.2d 1301, 1304 (9th Cir.1990), in which the court stated: "Rule 71 was designed to memorialize the commonsense rule that courts can enforce their orders against both parties and non-parties." Id. In particular, the courts are willing to enforce orders against nonparties when their nonparty status is used as a shield to frustrate the courts' orders. See, e.g., Wilson Motor Co. v. Dunn, 129 Okla. 211, 264 P. 194, 197 (1928) ("Such an absurd contention could only prevail where might was right and where utter contempt was in vogue of all law, courts, and orderly procedure").

Judicial Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Commerce, 34 F. Supp.2d 28, 43 (D.D.C. 1998) (footnote omitted). In that case, the Court held that its "orders compelling production of illegally withheld documents may be enforced not only against [Department of Commerce] but also against any nonparties to which the [Department of Commerce] transferred possession of responsive documents in an attempt to circumvent the FOIA and the orders of this Court." Id. at 44.

30. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has similarly affirmed contempt citations against non-parties for failure to comply with the terms of a judgment for the turnover of property. Peterson v. Highland Music, Inc., 140 F.3d 1313, 1323-24 (9th Cir.), cert. denied sub. nom., Gusto Records v. Peterson, 525 U.S. 983 (1998). The non-party defendants had notice of

the judgment for rescission, and their actions aided and abetted the actual defendants in violating the judgment. Id; see Irwin v. Mascott, 370 F.3d 924, 929-31 (9th Cir. 2004).

31. As noted above, the Debtor was subject to the permanent injunction in the Order for Final Judgment. (See, supra, at ¶ 21.) Accordingly, the Nevada District Court can enforce the Order for Final Judgment against the Debtor under Rules 70 and 71.

32. Domino's also has provided Debtor with the necessary due process to proceed against him in the Nevada District Court. Rule 71 provides that "the procedure for enforcing the order [against a nonparty] is the same as for a party." It has been held that the procedure for enforcing an injunction against a nonparty "is the same as it would be for enforcing it against [the defendant]. That procedure is governed by Rule 5 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In particular, Rule 5(b) allows for pleadings filed after the original complaint and other motions to be served upon the counsel of record for each party or upon the party himself when not represented by counsel. Service is considered complete upon mailing." City Cab Co. of Orlando, Inc. v. All City Yellow Cab, Inc., 581 F. Supp.2d 1197, 1200 (M.D. Fla. 2008).[5]

33. Domino's exceeded that service requirement because it served the Motion to Enforce Judgment on both the Debtor and his counsel. (See Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC v. Yeager, Case No. 3:10-CV-560 (D. Nev.), Doc. Id. Nos. 38 and 39; Devereaux Declaration Ex. 6, at p. 1 (confirming that Attorney Huckaby is counsel for the Debtor.) True and accurate copies of the Affidavits of Service of the Motion to Enforce Judgment are attached as Exhibit 1 to the Supplemental Devereaux Declaration. There is no question that Debtor's due process rights were satisfied in the Nevada District Court Proceeding.

V. Cause Exists to Waiver the 14-Day Stay of Order Granting Relief from Stay under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3)

34. Cause exists to waive the 14-day stay of any order granting relief from the automatic stay because the Debtor will already effectively receives the 14-day protection. It will likely take at least 14 days, if not longer, for Domino's to file another motion to enforce the Order

[5] The court in City Cab Co. of Orlando, Inc., 581 F. Supp.2d at 1200, did note that it must have personal jurisdiction over the nonparty. However, the Nevada District Court clearly has personal jurisdiction over the Debtor since he admits to residing in Nevada. (Doc. Id. No. 1, at pp. 1-2.)

for Final Judgment in the Nevada District Court Proceeding, complete briefing on such motion, and obtain a hearing on the motion. See Scripps GSB I, LLC v. A Partners, LLC (In re A Partners, LLC), 344 B.R. 114, 117 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2006) (waiving stay under Rule 4001(a)(3) since foreclosure sale will take more than the stay provided for under the rule).

VI. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set forth in the Motion for Relief from Stay, Domino's respectfully requests that this Court enter an order (i) granting Domino's relief from the automatic stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d) to take any and all actions necessary to enforce the permanent injunction in the Michigan District Court's Order for Final Judgment to compel the transfer of the telephone number to Domino's, including continuing the Nevada District Court Proceeding to enforce the Order and Final Judgment; (ii) waive the stay of such order under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3); and (iii) granting such further relief as is just and necessary.

Dated: October 30, 2011

ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP

By _*/s/ Louis M. Bubala III*____________

JANET L. CHUBB, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 176
LOUIS M. BUBALA III, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 8974
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
50 West Liberty
Suite 950
Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone (775) 784-3205
Facsimile (314) 613-8565
Email: lbubala@armstrongteasdale.com
bsalinas@armstrongteasdale.com

And

Eric Goldstein, Esq.
Shipman & Goodwin, LLP
One Constitution Plaza
Hartford, CT 06103

Attorneys for Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC and Domino's Pizza Master Issuer LLC